Chesterfield Borough Council

Response of Chesterfield Borough Council to proposals for High Speed Rail
(Published July 2013)

January 2014
INTRODUCTION

The following comments form the response of Chesterfield Borough Council to the proposed route of HS2 phase 2, published on 17th July 2013.

In preparing this response, the council has undertaken consultation with other interested parties including Derbyshire County Council, North East Derbyshire District Council, Bolsover District Council, Sheffield City Region LEP, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, Chesterfield Canal Partnership, Derbyshire Wildlife Trust, the National Trust, English Heritage and key landowners including Chatsworth Settlement Trust and Rhodia UK Ltd in regard to the proposed Staveley IMD and Henry Boot in connection with the Markham Vale development.

The response has also been informed by comments made to the council by other local residents, businesses and landowners during the consultation period but does not replace any specific comment these individuals or organisations may have made separately to HS2 in response to the consultation.

Where appropriate, reference is made in the response to further studies undertaken by the council, independently or jointly with other affected parties, into the potential implications of the HS2 proposals.

The response has been structured in three parts, the first addressing the consultation questions published on 17th July, the second providing more detailed consideration and comment on specific points, including suggested mitigation, and the third providing additional technical information that support the council’s comments and is intended to inform future design work on HS2.

Strategic Context

In July 2013 the council adopted the Local Plan; Core Strategy. The Core Strategy sets out the council’s spatial strategy for development up to 2031, including broad locations for new housing.

In terms of meeting the requirements for both new housing and employment land over the plan period, there is sufficient flexibility in the Core Strategy and choice of potential sites to accommodate HS2, based on the current route, without compromising overall targets for housing or employment land. However the specific route as published does potentially have a significant impact upon a number of specific regeneration schemes within the Core Strategy: the restoration of Chesterfield Canal and Chesterfield Waterside, Markham Vale Enterprise Zone, and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor regeneration.

The restoration of the Chesterfield Canal is a strategic objective of the plan, and as expressed there are concerns about the impact HS2 will have on this particular objective. The restoration of the canal is also fundamental to the delivery of the. Chesterfield Waterside project, a £350 million mixed use regeneration project, which has been designed around a new canal basin forming the starting point and terminus for the Chesterfield canal requiring its connection to the national waterways network via the full restoration of the canal to the River Trent.
The published route does have the potential to impact upon proposals for Markham Vale (Core Strategy policy PS4), and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor (Core Strategy policy PS5). Both of these sites are covered elsewhere in this response.

This position would have to be re-considered should the route change significantly, but it will not block or delay the progress of the Local Plan; Sites and Boundaries document, for which a preferred option is currently being prepared.
RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

(i) Do you agree or disagree with the Government’s proposed route between the West Midlands and Manchester? This includes the proposed route alignment, the location of tunnels, ventilation shafts, cuttings, viaducts and depots as well as how the high speed line will connect to the West Coast Main Line.

Answer:

The proposed route from the West Midlands to Manchester will not directly affect Chesterfield Borough.

(ii) Do you agree or disagree with the Government’s proposals for: a. A Manchester station at Manchester Piccadilly? b. An additional station near Manchester Airport?

Answer:

The proposed station at Manchester will not directly affect Chesterfield Borough unless it results in reduced station capacity at Manchester Piccadilly for Classic Rail services across the Pennines between Sheffield and Manchester.

(iii) Do you think that there should be any additional stations on the western leg between the West Midlands and Manchester?

Answer:

The proposed route from the West Midlands to Manchester will not directly affect Chesterfield Borough.

(iv) Do you agree or disagree with the Government’s proposed route between West Midlands and Leeds? This includes the proposed route alignment, the location of tunnels, ventilation shafts, cuttings, viaducts and depots as well as how the high speed line will connect to the East Coast Main Line.

Answer:

Whilst recognising the national and regional economic benefits that would result from a High Speed rail link between London, the West Midlands and Leeds, Chesterfield Borough Council has substantial and significant concerns regarding the proposed route alignment as published due to the potential negative impact on the economy, environment, connectivity and health and wellbeing of the borough and its residents and businesses.

These issues are discussed more fully below, identifying proposed mitigation measures where possible. Key issues for the borough include:

- The potential impact upon current and proposed regeneration projects at:
  - Markham Vale Enterprise Zone
  - Chesterfield Canal and Chesterfield Waterside
  - The Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor
- Potential reduced connectivity via Classic Rail to London, Birmingham, Leeds and other mainline station locations
• The actual and potential negative impacts upon the environment and quality of life for residents, and impacts upon property and land values at Duckmanton, Poolsbrook, Woodthorpe, Netherthorpe and Mastin Moor
• Impact upon Local Wildlife Sites and Netherthorpe Flash, Norbriggs Flash and the Doe Lee Valley.

(v) Do you agree or disagree with the Government’s proposals for:
   a. A Leeds station at Leeds New Lane?

Answer:

The proposed station at Leeds will not directly affect Chesterfield Borough.

b. A South Yorkshire station to be located at Sheffield Meadowhall?

Answer:

The council supports in principle a station at Sheffield. However it is noted that Meadowhall would be, in effect a ‘parkway’ station and improvements to access must be provided. Chesterfield currently has very limited direct Classic Rail services connecting to Meadowhall. Classic Rail connecting services must be improved.

CBC is aware that an alternative station location at Sheffield Victoria has been promoted by some correspondents. Although not significantly more accessible from Chesterfield, (as it would still require access through Sheffield’s central station) the council would support in principle this location as offering greater economic benefits to Sheffield City Centre, but subject to the possible impacts of any necessary re-alignment of the route and direct rail services being available from Chesterfield.

c. An East Midlands station to be located at Toton?

Answer:

The council supports in principle a Station at Toton. However it is noted that this would be, in effect, a ‘parkway’ station and there is currently no reasonable public transport access to this location from Chesterfield. Classic Rail connecting services must be improved to create and ensure connectivity between Chesterfield and Toton, which currently does not exist.

The council notes that an alternative East Midlands Hub station has been promoted by some respondents at Derby City as an alternative to Toton. Whilst recognising that this may have further, unconsidered implications in terms of the route, a station at Derby would be better connected to Chesterfield in terms of journey time and therefore is likely to be supported in principle as a better alternative for Chesterfield Borough.

(vi) Do you think that there should be any additional stations on the eastern leg between the West Midlands and Leeds?

No comment.
(vii) Please let us know your comments on the Appraisal of Sustainability (as reported in the Sustainability Statement) of the Government’s proposed Phase Two route, including the alternatives to the proposed route?

Answer:
The council welcomes HS2 Ltd.’s commitment to develop an ‘exemplar project’ and in the process, limit the projects negative impacts. The council welcomes the seven themes of the Sustainability Policy but disagree with some of the contents of the Sustainability Statement. These concerns are raised within the sections of this report and include:

- Query the amount of released capacity;
- The statement does not represent the significance of Chesterfield Canal with sufficient importance, nor does it acknowledge the impact that the full restoration of the canal has for the economic regeneration of Chesterfield, particularly at Chesterfield Waterside.;
- Paragraph 6.6 Airborne noise: impacts from noise are assessed from a residential perspective only. In the context particularly of the Trans-Pennine Trail, Cuckoo Way and Chesterfield Canal, where the high speed line is expected to parallel linear routes, the impact to the quiet quality of the green corridor could be significant.
- Paragraph 6.9.12 regarding landscape impacts does not mention the line of the future restoration of the Chesterfield Canal.

CBC have the following comments on Chapter 9:

- On Visual Impact (9.1) and Landscape Impact (9.2). Although there are no national landscape designations, the recreational value of assets such as the Trans-Pennine Trail to local communities is very high. Walking and cycling usage of this Trail is already recorded as the fourth busiest section of the whole of the Trans-Pennine Trail network. The Trail section between Staveley and Killamarsh is a significant asset for local communities and will be even more so when the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal, which runs parallel, is complete.
- On Wildlife and Ecology (9.3). Although there are no Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in this section, the opportunity is for the restoration of the Chesterfield Canal to positively contribute to both improving bio-diversity and providing quality green space for the enjoyment of local people. Unless adequate separation is accommodated from noise and disturbance from the high speed rail link, HS2 will potentially devalue this opportunity.
- It is noted that in paragraph 9.4.1 that there are opportunities for Water Resources to provide environmental enhancement. It would be useful to note that HS2 could support the Chesterfield Canal as such an opportunity in this area.

(viii) Please let us know your comments on how the capacity that would be freed up on the existing rail network by the introduction of the proposed Phase Two route could be used?

Answer:
More clarity is required about the potential impact of HS2 on Classic Rail services using Chesterfield Railway Station. It is critical that existing classic rail services operating from and through Chesterfield Railway Station should be improved and not reduced.
Released capacity should be used to significantly improve Direct connectivity to Sheffield Meadowhall HS2 station, in terms of frequency and time, and to create direct access to the proposed Toton Station.

There is an opportunity to use released capacity to improve local service, increasing the number of stations served directly from Chesterfield. However any improvements to local services should be balanced with maintaining regular fast services with Birmingham, Leicester and London.

The Chesterfield area currently benefits from good capacity for freight lines and there is no obvious demand for freed capacity to be used to provide additional freight provision. However it is noted that the line of HS2 and the connections necessary for the proposed IMD at Staveley have the potential to cut off rail freight access to major employment regeneration sites at Markham Vale. The preservation of these links should be designed into the proposals for HS2.

(ix) Please let us know your comments on the introduction of other utilities along the proposed Phase Two line of route?

The council recognises the value of the location of the former Staveley Works site as a potential Infrastructure Maintenance Depot for HS2, located between Leeds and Birmingham. The council supports the location in principle, recognising that it presents the only significant direct local benefit to Chesterfield Borough of the proposals for HS2, but has significant concerns regarding does not support the detailed location and layout of the site as currently proposed due to the potential impact on proposals for the wider regeneration of the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor which would need to be resolved as set out in the council’s detailed response.

These issues are discussed more fully below, identifying proposed mitigation measures where possible. Key issues for the borough include:

- Remediation of the site
- Making provision for the proposed Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route (CSRR) to be delivered on its planned alignment
- Minimising the impact of traffic associated with the construction and operational phases through maximising use of rail and improving the existing transport network
- The potential impact upon viability of wider regeneration proposals through the loss of potential housing sites
ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Borough-Wide

1.1. Whilst it is recognised that there are likely to be national and regional economic benefits from the proposed high speed rail line, the impacts upon Chesterfield Borough specifically of the proposals are predominantly negative, in terms of noise, environmental impact, disruption, particularly to residents on the eastern side of the borough (including residents on Bridle Road, Woodthorpe, and Riverdale Caravan Park, who would have to move) and impact upon committed regeneration schemes. It is likely that there would be a negative impact in land and property values close to the line, and potentially more widely on sites and development proposals that are predicated on the, currently excellent, rail connections provided by Chesterfield Railway Station.

1.2. The location of a proposed Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD) on the site of the former Staveley Works is recognised as the only significant direct benefit to the borough in terms of employment and economic development. Although this does not come without some costs in terms of the disruption of established plans for the regeneration of this land and the need to find alternative locations for uses that would be displaced from the site. A study of the economic impacts of the proposed IMD has been undertaken on behalf of CBC and DCC by consultants Volterra. This concludes that, whilst there would be some disruption to plans for the regeneration of Staveley Works through the displacement of proposed uses, in terms of overall job numbers the impact is largely neutral. It does however identify that the skill levels in the surrounding community are a good match for the likely jobs generated at the proposed depot. There is also likely to be a substantial short term boost to the local economy if the site is also used as a construction depot, generating revenues locally of between £1m and £1.2m over the construction period.

1.3. The relevant development plan for Chesterfield Borough is the Chesterfield Local Plan; Core Strategy 2013, and the saved policies of the Replacement Chesterfield Borough Local Plan 2006. Proposals for the development of HS2 should take account of the policies in these plans, which are set out in appendix 2, for clarity. Particular attention is drawn to policy CS12, ‘Economic Growth’, and the aim to encourage developers to maximise the use of local employment and supply chains. Given the scale of undertaking proposed in HS2 Phase II, the potential for benefits to the local economy and labour market should be maximised.

1.4. There is a concern that the uncertainty resulting from the proposals could have a significant impact upon investment decisions within the borough. The publication of the proposed route is already having a significant impact upon investment in the Markham Vale development and the Restoration of Chesterfield Canal (see below). There is also concern about the impact upon investment in Schemes such as Chesterfield Waterside (the regeneration of a 30ha+ site for a mix of housing and employment close to Chesterfield Town Centre). This scheme is based upon the regeneration of the start of Chesterfield Canal and accessibility to Chesterfield Railway Stations. Decisions must be made in the next few months about the investment of a £2.4m infrastructure loan in the provision of new canal infrastructure against a background of uncertainty in the future restoration of the canal introduced by the publication of the HS2 route.
Mitigation:

*The benefits of the location of the IMD within the borough should be maximised to mitigate the potential negative impacts of the route. Early engagement on identifying the types of skills and supplier that would be needed for the construction and operational phases of HS2 would be welcomed so that appropriate emphasis can be put on training for the right skills locally.*

*Clarification of whether the site of the IMD would also be used as a construction depot should be provided as soon as possible.*

*Certainty about the preferred route should be provided as soon as practical to provide certainty for investment decisions.*

Chesterfield Canal

1.5. Restoration of Chesterfield Canal to navigation within the borough boundary is one of the specific objectives of the council’s adopted Local Plan; Core Strategy (2013) and has been the subject of significant investment over the last 30 years in time, money and resources by the members of Chesterfield Canal partnership (which includes the Canal Trust, volunteer and the Local Authorities along the route). Approximately five miles of canal and associated footpaths and cycleways have been restored to navigation within Chesterfield Borough, linking a new canal basin in Staveley with the site of the proposed Chesterfield Waterside development adjacent to Chesterfield Town Centre.

Impact

1.6. The proposed route of the HS2 mainline severs the proposed restored route of the canal north of Norbriggs along what is referred to as the ‘Puddle Bank’. The route of the canal is further compromised by the access to the proposed Staveley Infrastructure Maintenance Depot, crossing the route of the canal in a number of locations.

1.7. The heights at which the published plans cross the route of the canal would also necessitate significant restructuring of a constructed lock serving the new Staveley Basin.
1.8. The HS2 proposals are also having a suppressing effect on the ability to continue with planned restoration of the canal from a funding perspective. A planned submission for Heritage Lottery Funding has already been withdrawn as a result of the uncertainty introduced by HS2 over the future restoration of the canal. The council would wish to see early agreement over any measures to allow for the continued delivery of the canal and associated infrastructure.

1.9. The restoration of the canal is also fundamental to the delivery of the Chesterfield Waterside project, a £350 million mixed use regeneration project, which has been designed around a new canal basin forming the starting point and terminus for the Chesterfield canal requiring its connection to the national waterways network via the full restoration of the canal to the River Trent.

Mitigation:

The proposals for HS2, including the IMD, should make provision for the restoration of Chesterfield Canal on, or as close as reasonably possible to, the currently proposed route.

The horizontal and vertical alignment of the proposed route and IMD access should be amended to avoid impact on the route of the canal and, where this is not possible, alternative provision for the canal should be agreed with Chesterfield Canal partnership and provided as part of the works for HS2.
1.10. Markham Vale is a 127.3 hectare employment site which straddles the three local planning Authorities in north eastern Derbyshire. Two thirds of the site is located in the south borough. Its regeneration is a key part of the area’s response to the loss of the mining industry. It is a strategic site serving a sub-regional area, with the potential to create up to 2,000 jobs which will assist the recovery of the local economy and communities. As of April 2012, Markham Vale also forms part of the Sheffield City Region Enterprise Zone, which seeks to encourage growth in the advanced manufacturing sector within the M1 corridor in North Derbyshire and South Yorkshire.

1.11. Planning permission was granted in 2005, establishing the principal of Industrial and Warehousing development, provision of a new junction on the M1 and associated loop road and provision for a rail freight terminal. The development has also seen extensive restoration of former colliery land, including a major spoil tip (‘south tip’). Significant development of the site has already been undertaken, including provision of the new junction 29a, phase I of the Staveley Northern Loop Road, construction of Waterloo Court (8 light industrial units) and a number of large B2/B8 use units have also been completed. Significant areas of the site are still available for development.

**Impact**

1.12. The proposed route of HS2 affects a number of specific elements of the Markham Vale development, which are set out below. The proposed route is also having a direct and immediate impact on investment in the site, with potential occupiers of the affected plots unwilling to invest whilst there is uncertainty on the potential impact of HS2 on these plots.
1.13. Starting from the south, the proposed route of HS2 enters the Markham Vale site via a cutting through the South Tip. This former spoil heap contains contaminated waste, in the form of phenolic contaminants in lagoons buried under colliery and other waste resulting from the disposal of waste from the former Coalite Chemical Works adjacent to the site. As a matter of principal the disturbance of material within the tip should be avoided if at all possible. The tip is also made ground and, as such, any cutting through it is likely to present additional engineering difficulties in terms of the need for ground compaction and retaining structures. The tip, and associated planting, also acts to screen the bulk of the Markham Vale development as seen in views from the nearby Bolsover Castle, an Ancient Monument.

1.14. The route then passes through the eastern part of Plot 1 and part of Plot 7 of the Markham Vale Development. Plot 1 (the ‘Green Giant’) is the largest plot on Markham Vale, with planning permission for a single building of over 500,000 sq ft for industrial or warehousing use. It was also one of the sites identified as being able to benefit from Enhanced Capital Allowances as part of Markham Vale’s Enterprise Zone status. Although the council (along with Sheffield City Region LEP) is in discussion with the government about greater flexibility in how these ECAs are applied (to allow for the inclusion of other parts of the Markham Vale site), this has not been confirmed at the time of writing. Whilst the impact of HS2 on this plot is uncertain, it is unlikely that investment in this site will be forthcoming and the opportunity to take advantage of the capital allowance on the largest building on the site will be lost.

1.15. Before crossing the M1 to the north, the route of the line also affects the location of the balancing ponds that form part of Markham Vale’s Sustainable Drainage scheme, and sever the potential rail connection to the part of the site identified for a possible future railhead. Beyond the M1, the route of HS2 then affects part of plots 13 and 14, part of the ‘Seymour Extension’. Planned as a later phase of Markham Vale, these sites are included on the list of potential Enhanced Capital Allowance sites and were to be the subject of proposed infrastructure works to create access to the site. The route of HS2 adversely affects the proposed access arrangements.

1.16. Several former railways run through the Markham Vale scheme, connecting to the existing network at Barrow Hill. The HS2 scheme as currently proposed would sever these routes. These lines provide the option of serving Markham Vale sites by rail. Other options include the possibility a passenger halt in the Seymour Junction area to serve Markham Vale in the future, and longer term- passenger routes through to Bolsover and/or Clowne and Creswell. Freight routes to the former Oxcroft Coal Disposal point at Stanfree and to the former Coalite works would also be removed. Rail access to the adjoining Erin Waste Disposal Site (between Poolsbrook and Duckmanton) has been under active discussion with the operators.

Mitigation:

The proposed route of HS2 should be re-aligned where possible to minimise the impact upon regeneration at Markham Vale, including allowing for future passenger and freight rail access from the Classic Rail network and to remove the need for a cutting through the south tip.
Should a cutting through the south tip be required, a detailed scheme of remediation and environmental management will be necessary and the design make provision to continue to provide screening of Markham Vale in views from Bolsover Castle.

The proposed route of HS2 through Markham Vale should be clarified as soon as possible to allow investment decisions to be made about this critical regeneration site.

Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor

1.17. The Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor is the largest regeneration opportunity within chesterfield borough (covering approximately 150 ha). It has major implications in terms of its ability to deliver new housing, employment and improved environment. The corridor consists of mostly vacant former industrial land, historically a site of heavy industry. Employment on the site has declined over a number of decades to the point where the Clocktower and Devonshire Business Centres on Works Road are now the only active employment uses within the site.

1.18. The area has in the past been subject to a range of uses, including foundries, chemical works and areas of opencast coal mining and landfill. All of these have left a difficult legacy of contaminated land and problematic ground conditions. The decline of manufacturing on the site has also left a legacy of economic and social problems in the surrounding settlements. In particular Barrow Hill, which as well as having relied heavily on the site for jobs, has become physically isolated from nearby settlements by vacant and derelict land. Chesterfield Canal and the River Rother run through the site, with a former mineral railway line to the north. The River Rother splits the corridor in half, with the HS2 Infrastructure Maintenance Depot proposed on the eastern half of the site.

1.19. In November 2012, the Borough Council published carried out consultation on a draft Area Action Plan Development Plan Document for the regeneration of the corridor. This proposed the regeneration of the area for a mix of up to 2000 new dwellings, 28ha of new industrial and commercial floorspace, improvements to green infrastructure and provision of a spine road that would form part of a wider Chesterfield to Staveley Regeneration route, taking traffic out of the vulnerable town centre of Brimington and linking into the newly opened Staveley Northern Loop road and the M1 at Junction 29a. The AAP was prepared following extensive consultation with the surrounding communities and the main landowners.

1.20. The part of the site affected by the proposed IMD is owned by Chatsworth Settlement Trust and there have been extensive discussions between the Trust, Derbyshire County Council and the Borough Council over the potential impacts and benefits of the IMD proposal, with joint studies being commissioned to consider the economic and transport impacts of the depot.
Impact

1.21. **Impact on Housing Proposals** - The proposed IMD is located within the area identified in the draft AAP as the ‘Hall Lane Character Area’ and was expected to deliver approximately 850 new dwellings and 30ha of employment land. This part of the site was anticipated to form a later phase of development due to the need for
significant remediation, and would be unlikely to contribute towards the council’s required 5-year supply of land for housing development in the short term.

1.22. The 11-ha depot would extend from Hall Lane, across this part of the site to the River Rother to the west. Although the impact of the depot is not currently clear, it is anticipated that it would require 24 hour working, including the movement and loading of rolling stock and maintenance vehicles. It is likely that this would require the proposed depot to be densely illuminated.

1.23. This is likely to preclude the development of housing in the remainder of the character area due to the impact of noise, lighting and the depot severing the site from other areas proposed for housing development. Future stages of the local plan will need to identify alternative housing sites to mitigate for this loss. However the potential for employment development in the character area is less likely to be affected and there may be a corresponding increase in the element of employment land proposed.

1.24. Economic Impact & Viability The mix of uses proposed in the draft AAP was selected in part to provide the most viable form of development, with the higher value uses (residential and retail) balancing out the infrastructure and remediation costs and the lower land value uses. The likely loss of the housing element of the AAP will affect this balance. The extent of this is not yet clear as it is not yet know on what basis the IMD would be procured. If this leaves the AAP proposals with a substantial funding gap it may impact on the viability of the whole corridor.

1.25. If the development of the IMD is demonstrated to be significantly detrimental to the overall viability of the regeneration proposals for the corridor, the council will expect HS2 to compensate for this impact. This could include agreeing to the early delivery of critical transport infrastructure (see below) and/or assisting with remediation of the wider site.

1.26. It is anticipated that overall, the development of the IMD on the site is likely to have a positive impact upon employment, with the jobs at the IMD (currently estimated at 100-150) being additional to the planned employment development from the AAP which could be re-accommodated elsewhere on the site. The nearby settlement of Barrow Hill is within the bottom 10% locally and nationally in the indices of multiple deprivation, with particular problems with employment, education and skills. A study of the economic impacts of the proposed IMD has been undertaken on behalf of CBC and DCC by consultants Volterra. This concludes that, whilst there would be some disruption to plans for the regeneration of Staveley Works through the displacement of proposed uses, in terms of overall job numbers the impact is largely neutral. It does however identify that the skill levels in the surrounding community are a good match for the likely jobs generated at the proposed depot. There is also likely to be a substantial short term boost to the local economy if the site is also used as a construction depot, generating revenues locally of between £1m and £1.2m over the construction period.

1.27. Barrow Hill is also the home of Barrow Hill Engine Shed, a centre for railway heritage and engineering, links which could be exploited to maximise local employment within the depot. The site is currently home to two firms refurbishing rolling stock for use on the Classic Rail network and trains around 30 apprentices in rail engineering per year. Newcastle University also operate a unit on site researching modern rail
technology and the Engine Shed society has plans to expand the commercial and training elements of the site. There is the potential to generate strong links with the skills needed for Infrastructure Maintenance of HS2 and the IMD, particularly in light of recently announced proposals for a FE college as part of HS2 providing training in railway skills.

1.28. **Remediation and Ground Conditions** - The entrance to the depot at the eastern end would sit on top of a former spoil tip and chemical works, and the remainder of the site includes a combination of former chemical works and opencast mine workings. An assessment of ground conditions on this site was carried out as part of the Baseline Evidence Report for the AAP and is available on the council’s website ([www.chesterfield.gov.uk](http://www.chesterfield.gov.uk)). The construction of the depot would require the remediation of that part of the site and provide a clear end user for a complex brownfield site. Early confirmation that HS2 would be responsible for remediation of this part of the site and development of a programme and timetable would be welcomed.

1.29. **Access & Transport Issues** – Road access to this site is currently very limited. There is a single road access from Hall Lane to the east. An existing (but currently close) Bailey Bridge potential provides access from the Works Road to the west, over the River Rother, although this is unlikely to be suitable for significant heavy traffic due to the limitations of the existing bridge, the adequacy of the junction of Works Road, the A619 to the south, restricted height bridges on Works Road to the north and the need to travel through predominantly residential areas. As a result the proposal to provide a connection to the Classic Rail network to service the IMD using the former minerals railway line north of the site is welcomed.

1.30. However it is inevitable that some road access to the site will also be necessary, particularly during the construction period before rail access is secured and to provide access for employees (as working hours are likely to be difficult to serve by public transport). Early phases of the regeneration of the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor are expected to involve the development of a new residential community and Local Centre around Works Road and land to the west, which would not be compatible with significant levels of construction traffic, this should therefore be directed to the Hall Lane access as far as possible.

1.31. Over the Longer term the AAP makes provision for delivery of part of the proposed Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route (CSRR) through the corridor. This strategic transport proposal is intended to provide a link between the Northern Loop Road (and from there J29a on the M1) and the A61 in Chesterfield, removing through traffic from the congested centres of Brimington and Staveley and opening up the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor for development. The location of the IMD as currently proposed does not make allowance for the preferred route, which is intended to cross the River Rother in the location of the existing Bailey Bridge.

1.32. CBC, DCC and Chatsworth Settlement Trust appointed Arups to study the potential for alternative options that would allow for the provision of the CSSR and the IMD (see below). The council’s preferred solution would be for a realignment of the location of the IMD to lay alongside the existing rail line to the north. This would allow space for the provision of the CSRR close to its proposed route, maximising development opportunities to the east and west of its River Rother crossing, and
limiting the amount of land potentially sterilised by the IMD between the depot and the existing rail line. The layout and location of the proposed IMD should be amended to make provision for this route, on the basis set out in the Arup study. As early access to the site will be needed in order to carry out remediation and construction works for the IMD, the council would welcome early discussion with HS2 as to the timing and nature of these works where they may be able to assist with the delivery of the CSRR.

1.33. A key footpath connection between the settlements of Barrow Hill and Staveley currently runs across the Staveley Works site, which would be severed by the IMD. The route currently runs through a pedestrian tunnel on the site and the intention in the AAP was to enhance and improve this route. Provision should be made to maintain and improve this link as part of the IMD proposals.

1.34. **Construction Phase** - The proposals published as part of the consultation on HS2 do not make mention of sites for the construction phase of HS2. Given the location of the proposed IMD, the area of land available and it’s potential connections to the Classic Rail freight network and the M1, the potential to use this site as a construction depot is clear. Derbyshire is also a significant supplier of minerals and aggregates and such a use could support local supply chains. If utilised as a construction site, the need to make early improvements to access and transport would be crucial. The site benefits from connections to both the existing rail network (to the north of the proposed IMD) and access to the M1 via the Staveley Northern Loop Road and J29a. Any construction access should use these routes to avoid impacting residential areas off Works Road. Co-operation with HS2 on the early delivery of the parts of the CSRR within the Staveley Works site would also enable construction access as well as assisting with the longer term regeneration of the site.

**Mitigation**

*Early confirmation is sought that HS2 would be responsible for the remediation of the site of the IMD and the programme for doing so.*

*The layout and location of the proposed IMD should be amended to make provision for the proposed Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route (CSRR), on the basis set out in the attached ARUPs study. Early discussion with HS2 as to the timing and nature of these works is sought where they may be able to assist with the delivery of the CSRR.*

*The proposal for a link to the Classic Rail network north of the site to serve the IMD is welcomed. A clear and enforceable travel plan should be put in place for the IMD construction and operational phases to maximise the use of rail access and minimise impact upon the local highway and transport network.*

*Improvements to the existing highways network should be provided in advance of construction of the IMD where necessary.*

*The potential loss of housing development from the wider AAP will have an impact on the overall viability of regeneration proposals. Compensation for this should be made through the provision of infrastructure and/or*
remediation to support redevelopment of the remainder of the Staveley Works site as part of HS2 proposals for the IMD.

The lighting should be designed to be sympathetic to the surrounding environment and be designed to minimise impact on nearby residential dwellings.
2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

General

2.1. Within Chesterfield Borough a number of existing properties within the borough (mostly dwellings) will be directly affected by the line to the extent of being at risk of demolition. Two dwellings on Bridle Road, Woodthorpe, are very close to where a cutting is proposed whilst on the south side of Worksop Road (A619), the last property in Norbriggs before the River Doe Lea will be within about 50 metres of the viaduct carrying the railway.

2.2. The southern branch providing access to the IMD crosses the north eastern corner of the Riverdale Park Homes Site at Lowgates. It seems likely that some of these Park Homes would become uninhabitable in this location, but it is not known how many, or whether they could be moved to an alternative site. Planning officers have discussed the implications with the owner/operators of the site and identified a possible relocation opportunity on an adjacent site.

Noise

2.3. The council’s Environmental Health officers have examined the report on the noise implications of the proposals.

2.4. Those properties closest to the line and most likely to be adversely affected in Chesterfield Borough (with a noise increase to over 50dB(A) that would exceed the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommended limit for outdoor sound level) include much of Long Duckmanton and Duckmanton, all of Poolsbrook, Woodthorpe, Norbriggs and Mastin Moor and most of Lowgates and Netherthorpe and the Hartington Estate. Staveley Town Centre is also likely to be affected. The noise implications of the Infrastructure Maintenance Depot north of Staveley do not appear to have been separately assessed although can be expected to be worst for residents of Hartington, immediately to the north of the access line to the IMD, and remaining properties on Riverdale Caravan Park, not directly under the proposed line. Operation of the IMD is likely to be busiest in mornings and evenings as maintenance vehicles arrive and leave and this is likely to magnify any adverse impacts.

2.5. At this stage very few details have been given about the measures to be taken to reduce the impact that railway noise will have on its surroundings, or the harm that the construction work may do to biodiversity, archaeology, landscape and so on. Measures of this kind are usually termed ‘mitigation’. The HS2 noise report does refer to some mitigation works being feasible and models those effects for about half of the main line within the borough and for a further small stretch just to the south, in North East Derbyshire. No detail of any of these possible mitigation works is available, however.

Mitigation

*Further modelling should be undertaken to establish the potential impacts of noise and vibration resulting from the operation of the IMD, taking into account the likely 24-hour operation and the proximity of residential properties at Hartington and Riverdale Caravan Park.*
Mitigation measures to minimise adverse noise impact should be designed into the scheme and set out in the detailed design stage of the Phase II proposals.

**Biodiversity**

2.6. The proposed route of HS2 passes through the Local Nature Reserves of Norbriggs Flash and the Local Wildlife Site of Norbriggs Flash, and close to the Doe Lea Wildlife Site. The potential impact upon these nature reserves has not been assessed at this stage and no specific measures identified to minimise and/or mitigate against any adverse impact.

---

**Mitigation**

*Detailed assessment is needed where the route of HS2 passes through the Local Nature reserves of Norbriggs, Netherthorpe and Doe Lee Flashes. The detailed design and routing of HS2 should minimise any adverse impact and, in line with the NPPF, deliver net gains in biodiversity where possible. A detailed plan for the mitigation and management of any remaining adverse impacts should be included.*

**Archaeology**

2.7. The council’s Conservation Officer has assessed the line of the route against the Historic Environment Record for Chesterfield. The route does not adversely impact...
upon any listed buildings, conservation areas or other statutory heritage designations within the borough. There is limited potential impact upon archaeological remains which are set out in appendix 1. Advice should be sought from the County Archaeologists whether there will be a need for an archaeological watching brief, otherwise the proposed route should not cause harm in this respect.

2.8. Two properties currently under consideration for a Local List of buildings of historic or architectural significance are adversely affected: Woodthorpe Grange and 23 Bridle Road, the latter of which is shown as being lost to a cutting for HS2.

Mitigation

*The design of the cutting where the line of HS2 crosses Bridle Road should be redesigned to allow for the retention of the existing property at no 23 Bridle Road.*

*The potential for impact on archaeology should be assessed in detail as part of the assessment of HS2 and a scheme for archaeological investigation and recording of any affected material be set up in line with best practice advice from English Heritage.*

Flood Risk

2.9. The route of HS2 passes through a number of locations identified on the Environment Agency Flood maps for Chesterfield as being within flood risk zones 2 and 3 and crosses the course of the River Doe Lea in three places.

Mitigation

*Any structures or embankments within areas of high flood risk have the potential to increase the severity of any flooding. The detailed design of HS2 Phase II in these locations will need to be the subject of a detailed Flood Risk assessment and discussion with the Environment Agency and Strategic Drainage Board.*
3. TRANSPORT ISSUES

3.1. Chesterfield currently benefits from excellent ‘Classic Rail’ links, being on the crossing point of East Midlands Mainline Services between London and Sheffield, Cross Country Services between the West Country and Scotland, and Trans Pennine Services between the East of England and Manchester/Liverpool. At peak times there are twice hourly direct services to London St Pancras and Birmingham New Street, taking approximately 2 hours and 1 hour respectively. Fast access to Sheffield (about 15 minutes) also brings connections to many other parts of the country within easy reach.

3.2. Currently this gives Chesterfield an advantage in attracting inward investment, with faster connections to London and Birmingham than the city of Sheffield benefits from, combined with lower commercial rents and good quality of life. Chesterfield’s largest regeneration scheme, Chesterfield Waterside (valued at a £300m project), is designed to take advantage of its proximity to the railway station and these good quality links in attracting investment in commercial floorspace. In order to support these regeneration projects, existing levels of service to and from Chesterfield Railway Station should be maintained and improved.

3.3. With significantly reduced journey times to London St Pancras and Birmingham New Street (79 minutes and 38 minutes), HS2 will reverse this situation, putting Chesterfield at a disadvantage in this respect. There is a clear assumption that a significant proportion of patronage will move from Classic Rail to HS2, reflected in the consideration of how released capacity on Classic Rail routes will be used.

3.4. It is noted that both of the proposed HS2 stations nearest to Chesterfield could be considered ‘Parkway’ stations, located on the fringes of urban areas and without the benefits of the comprehensive public transport links that currently serve the centres of Sheffield, Derby and Nottingham. Transport connections (and in particular public transport connections) between Chesterfield and these three cities are focused on the city centres. Significant improvements to services, over and above what currently exists, would be needed to provide connections to Toton and Meadowhall.

3.5. Currently Chesterfield has only very limited direct services to the existing Sheffield Meadowhall station (the majority of services requiring a change at Sheffield Midlands) and now direct connection to Toton, which currently does not possess a Classic Rail station, the nearest being Long Eaton, with most journeys requiring a change at Derby.

3.6. Although the Network Rail paper ‘Better Connections – Options for the integration of High Speed 2’ considers possible scenarios for the parts of the network North of Leicester there are no firm proposals. If these included long distance services stopping at more stations (identified as a potential option), this would further exacerbate the situation by increasing journey times further still.

3.7. In order to mitigate the potential adverse economic impact resulting from a significant shift in the relative quality of rail connections to destinations south of Chesterfield, released capacity on the Classic Rail network should be used, at least in part, to improve and strengthen Chesterfield’s connectivity to the HS2 stations. Chesterfield to Sheffield Meadowhall in particular should be upgraded to provide fast, regular,
direct services. Improving service to Toton would also be beneficial, although to a considerably lesser degree, and would require extension of existing services from Long Eaton.

3.8. Whilst it is acknowledged that there may be benefits to increasing the number of stops on longer distance services in terms of improving local connectivity (with increased service from Chesterfield to Belper, Alfreton, Duffield and Dronfield for example), this should be balanced by retaining (albeit potentially at a reduced frequency), fast inter-city services as an alternative to HS2.

3.9. The council is aware that an alternative East Midlands Hub station at Derby (rather than Toton) has been put forward by a number of parties. Notwithstanding that there are a number of potential practical and economic issues with this proposal, the council must acknowledge that this would provide a better connection between Chesterfield and HS2 than the proposed station at Toton, with the potential for shorter, direct services. An alternative station at Derby would be supported in principle by the council.

Mitigation

*HS2 Phase II will lead to Chesterfield having poorer connections to London and Birmingham, relative to Sheffield City, than is currently the case.*

*More clarity is required about the potential impact of HS2 on Classic Rail services using Chesterfield Railway Station.*

*Existing levels of service to Chesterfield railway station should be maintained and improved.*

*Released capacity must be used to significantly improve Direct connectivity to Sheffield Meadowhall HS2 station, in terms of frequency and time, and to create direct access to the proposed Toton Station where none currently exists.*

*There is an opportunity to use released capacity to improve local service, increasing the number of stations served directly from Chesterfield. However any improvements to local services should be balanced with maintaining regular fast services with Birmingham, Leicester and London*
4. HEALTH AND EQUALITIES IMPACTS

4.1. A Health Impact Assessment of the HS2 proposals has been undertaken by Derbyshire County Council as part of their response to the consultation. This makes a number of specific recommendations to HS2 relating to health and inequality.

4.2. The report particularly highlights the sensitivity of the parts of the route through Chesterfield Borough in terms of the proximity to existing residential areas (and the potential impact from disturbance and noise during construction and operation), impact on landscape, and the proximity of areas of multiple deprivation, particularly in respect of employment.

4.3. The report gives weight to the council’s position, set out above, on the need to consider local labour and skills, further noise modelling and design solutions that respect the character and amenity of the surrounding landscape.
## APPENDIX 1 - SCHEDULE OF SPECIFIC ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>IMD access track in close proximity to Staveley Town Basin and is on alignment of Chesterfield canal ‘puddle bank’ planned for restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>IMD provides employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>IMD development on brownfield site, regenerating land not currently used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Road access to IMD from Works Road, potentially increasing number of heavy vehicles using this road (although it is already used by heavy and is away from housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>IMD close to Barrow Hill existing housing area (approx. 500 properties) and to Hartington Estate and is overlooked by Staveley Town. Noise and floodlighting potential disruption to residential amenity, as rail maintenance will be at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Infrastructure trains accessing the IMD from the classic network will potentially use up freight paths on the Chesterfield to Rotherham route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherthorpe</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 viaduct over A619 Worksop Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodthorpe</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Bridle Road bridge over HS2 route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poolsbrook</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 viaduct over M1 and Doe Lea flood plain - construction delays on the M1 and wider area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poolsbrook</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 route crosses railway siding to Bolsover (although this may not currently be in active use. Consideration of any impact on Coalite site rail access provision ( The Coalite site is currently the subject of Masterplan proposals and planning applications are anticipated). Also consideration of rail freight at Markham vale and plots in general. Network rail have already closed the Bolsover Branch Line and are selling to DCC to operate as a private siding for the benefit of Markham vale. The loss of the sidings could be an opportunity as additional development plot area could be created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>IMD located within identified regeneration area subject to emerging proposals for up to 2000 dwellings and employment use. Compromises wider regeneration proposals through impact on development values, residential amenity and viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>IMD access through former chemical works (previously iron foundry). Possible reprofiling of existing spoil heap understood to contain substantial foundry waste. Significant remediation works/costs will be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>IMD crosses route of existing RoW from Barrow Hill to Staveley. Could decrease already compromised accessibility of Barrow Hill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>IMD would provide mechanism to secure remediation of significant portion of former chemical works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Opportunity to realign RoW from Barrow Hill to Staveley and remove pedestrian tunnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Location of IMD has potential to restrict ability to deliver proposed Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route through former Staveley Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>Potential to support delivery of part of Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration route in providing access to site, providing suitable compromise layout of IMD can be reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Rail connection between HS2 IMD and mainline railway between IMD site and Barrow Hill likely to sever potential for mainline rail access to Markham Vale Enterprise Zone and Erin Void landfill site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>Potential impact of IMD on setting of Staveley Town Centre Conservation Area and Grade II listed Staveley Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherthorpe</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 route cuts through Netherthorpe Flashes Local Wildlife Site (CHO 52).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherthorpe</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 route cuts through Norbriggs Flash Local Wildlife Site (CHO 51).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherthorpe</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 route would require re-routing of HV overhead power lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherthorpe</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 route in cutting goes through Woodthorpe Grange (former farmhouse now in general residential use).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Vale</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>HS2 route cuts through existing and committed development at Markham Vale Enterprise Zone east of J29a on M1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Markham Vale | Threat | • between 25m and 100m wide taken off plot 13, (has Enhanced Capital Allowance as part of the Sheffield City Region's Enterprise Zone).  
• HS2 prevents the development of a rail freight terminal at Seymour. |
<p>| Markham Vale | Threat | HS2 embankment crossing Markham Vale Reservoir (required to reduce the chances of flooding further downstream).                                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markham Vale (Plot 2 North)</th>
<th>Threat</th>
<th>Plot 2 North: design includes a new access off Markham Lane to the plot but close to HS2 embankment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Markham Vale (Plot 1 North) | Threat | Plot 1 North  
• Risk of losing potential occupier.  
• planned rail sidings and use of branch line lost.  
• embankment closes off the Viridor access road, (used to access Erin landfill site). |
| Markham Vale | Threat | North Tip and Surface Water Storage Facility  
• no allowance for access to the North Tip.  
• Public Art at Markham Vale: the Markham Horse no longer viable, marketing opportunity lost.  
• The Surface Water storage ponds are totally obliterated by the proposed HS2 embankments. |
| Markham Vale (Plot 1 Green Giant) | Threat | Plot 1 Green Giant  
• between 50m wide and 100m wide taken by HS2, preventing planned development.  
• loss of employment opportunities, public investment; marketing until route is fixed; reduction in potential; blight on use. |
| Markham Vale (Buttermilk Lane) | Threat | A new bridge is proposed to carry the HS2 across Buttermilk Lane.  
• A pumped rising main serving the Councils water treatment lagoons runs parallel to Buttermilk Lane.  
• The Council have a maintenance track running along the toe of the slope to the south tip parallel to Buttermilk Lane. Risk to continued use of the track. |
| Markham Vale | Threat |  
• The Meadow House Way Road serving Plot 9A is bisected by the HS2 embankment; no alternative shown.  
• A new road from Buttermilk Lane across part of the former Coalite Site needed to provide access to Bolsover HWRC. Other plots on Plot 9A blighted.  
• Utilities are within the Meadow House Road highway corridor. |
| Markham Vale | Threat | HS2 route cuts through committed development at Markham Vale Enterprise Zone (Seymour extension) north of M1.  
• HS2 crosses the route of the planned Seymour Link Road - now being redesigned.  
• private rail sidings at Markham and Coalite protected but HS2 proposals preclude these as well as... |
the continued use of the branch line through and beyond the west side of Markham Vale to Bolsover.

| Markham Vale | Threat | HS2 cutting runs through former Markham Colliery south spoil tip. 1) Major contaminated land issue TBC and 2) In current vegetated state forms significant screen for industrial area and motorway in view from Bolsover Castle (so *setting of Listed Building*).  
• cutting will interrupt the drainage paths of contaminated water which is collected and treated at the lagoons on Buttermilk Lane.  
• The cutting splits the Council’s ownership, creating a new liability. Not sure that the HS2 route reduces the screening effect of the South Tip |
| Poolsbrook | Threat | HS2 route close to, and likely to affect, Doe Lea Flash Local Wildlife Site (CHO 12). |
| Poolsbrook | Threat | HS2 route close to, and likely to affect, Poolsbrook Flash Local Wildlife Site (CHO 11). |
| Poolsbrook | Threat | HS2 route crosses freight railway siding to Oxcroft disposal point (although this may not currently be in active use). |

**Historic Environment Records** - records of archaeological sites

- MDR 11588 - GCR Markham Colliery Branch Railway (route of)
- MDR 11016 - Midland Railway, Doe Lea Branch (route of)
- MDR 11650 - Chesterfield to Worksop (via Brimington) Turnpike Road
- MDR 11055 - Great Central Railway, Derbyshire Main Line, (route of)
- MDR 11078 - Hartington (formerly New Hollingwood) Colliery, Staveley (site of)
- MDR 6138 - Earthwork/cropmark features, Norbriggs, Staveley (natural feature)
- MDR 6152 - Chesterfield Canal
## APPENDIX 2 - CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN; CORE STRATEGY POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Relevant to HS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Spatial Strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1 - Spatial Strategy</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2 - Principles for the Location of Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 - Infrastructure Delivery</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Changing Climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS5 - Renewable Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS6 - Sustainable Design and Construction</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS7 - Management of the Water Cycle</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS8 - Environmental Quality</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS9 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homes and Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10 – Flexibility in Delivery of Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS11 - Range of Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS12 – Sites for Gypsies and Travellers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs, Centres and Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13 - Economic Growth</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14 - Tourism and the Visitor Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS15 - Vitality and Viability of Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS16 – Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17 - Social Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design and the Built Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS18 – Design</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS19 - Historic Environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel and Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS20 - Influencing the Demand for Travel</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS21 - Major Transport Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making Great Places</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS1 - Chesterfield Town Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS2 - Chatsworth Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS3 – Chesterfield Waterside and the Potteries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS4 - Markham Vale</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS5 - Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS6 - Neighbourhood Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Relevant to HS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSN1 - Sites for Residential Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment, economic regeneration and tourism</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP2 - Donkin/UEF Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP5 - Other Employment Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP7 - Existing business and industrial areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP11 - Ecodome Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVR1 - Green Belt</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVR2 - Open countryside &amp; other land</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS2 - Markham Vale Transport Schemes</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS3 - Chesterfield-Staveley Regeneration Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRS6 - Whitting Valley Link Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shopping, town centres, district and local facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC1 - Development within existing town, district and local centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC2 - Provision of new or extended local centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHC3 - New retail warehousing on land at Markham Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks, open space and recreation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS1 - Existing parks &amp; open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS2 - New public open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS4 - Sport pitches and playing fields</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS5 - Allotments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community, health and education facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMT1 - Education sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMT5 - Protection of existing community facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Plan; Core Strategy policies

**CS1 Spatial Strategy**

The overall approach to growth will be to concentrate new development within walking and cycling distance of centres, and to focus on areas that need regenerating.

**Regeneration Priority Areas**

The council will maximise development opportunities that offer regeneration benefits to communities in areas suffering from multiple deprivation as set out in the published Indices of Multiple Deprivation. Initially the focus will be in the following areas:

- Eastern Villages– Barrow Hill, Duckmanton, Mastin Moor, Poolsbrook
- Rother Ward
- Holme Hall
Housing Growth
The council will make provision for the delivery of a minimum of 7,600 dwellings over the period 2011 to 2031. Locations for major new housing development will be in line with the strategy of ‘Concentration and Regeneration’, with growth distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% of total dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield Sub-Regional Centre</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including Chatsworth Road District Centre and Whittington Moor District Centre)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Site</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staveley Town Centre</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service centres</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brimington, Hasland and HolmeHall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regeneration Priority Areas</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Barrow Hill, Duckmanton, Mastin Moor, Poolsbrook, Rother Ward)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Centres</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Growth
To maintain economic growth and quality of provision, the council will make provision for 79 hectares of new employment land (B1, B2 and B8 uses) over the period 2011 to 2031. The key areas for employment land are at the already committed Markham Vale development, and at Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor. Policy CS13 sets out broad locations for employment uses.

Green Belt
The existing Green Belt will be maintained and enhanced.

Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges
Strategic gaps give distinct identity to different areas, prevent neighbouring settlements from merging into one another, and maintain open space. Green Wedges provide access to the countryside from urban areas. The open character of Strategic Gaps will be protected from development between:
- Brimington and Tapton
- Ringwood and Hollingwood
- Lowgates / Netherthorpe and Woodthorpe / Mastin Moor
- Woodthorpe and Markham Vale
- Old Whittington and New Whittington
- Brimington North

Green Wedges provide access to the countryside from urban areas. Green Wedges will be protected from development at:
- Walton River Hipper Corridor
- Birdholme / Hasland River Rother Corridor
- Hasland and Spital
- Holme Hall and Newbold Green

The broad locations of Strategic Gaps and Green Wedges are identified on the Key Diagram and will be defined in detail in the Local Plan: Sites and
Boundaries. The boundaries will be based on an assessment of the character of the proposed Green Wedge or Strategic Gap and its contribution to: the setting and identity of the borough and its urban areas; landscape character, habitat and biodiversity; access to countryside and recreation; the ability to connect areas of green infrastructure; and the impact that development would have on the function of the Green Wedge or Strategic Gap. Should work on Regeneration Priority areas show the need, Strategic Gaps or Green Wedges will also be defined in the Local Plan: Sites and Boundaries.

**CS2 Principles for Location of Development**

In allocating new development, or assessing planning applications for developments that are not allocated in a DPD, sites will be assessed by the extent to which the proposals meet the following requirements:

a) deliver the council’s Spatial Strategy (policy CS1);

b) are on previously developed land that is not of high environmental value;

c) are not on the best and most versatile agricultural land;

d) deliver wider regeneration and sustainability benefits to the area;

e) utilise existing capacity in social infrastructure (policy CS17) or are of sufficient scale to provide additional capacity, either on site or through contributions towards off-site improvements;

f) maximise opportunities for walking and cycling and the use of public transport (policy CS20);

g) meet sequential test requirements set out by other national or local policies.

In assessing the suitability of sites for specific uses the council will also take into consideration whether the proposed use:

i. needs to be in a specific location in order to serve a defined local catchment or need, to access specific resources or facilities (including transport connections) or to make functional links to other, existing uses;

ii. is required to regenerate sites and locations that could not otherwise be addressed or to support existing community facilities that otherwise would be at risk of closure.

Where evidence of such circumstances can be clearly demonstrated, alternative locations that may not be in strict accordance with the council’s spatial strategy will be considered against other national and local planning policy.

All developments will be required to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of users or adjoining occupiers, taking into account things such as noise, odour, air quality, traffic, appearance, overlooking, shading or other environmental, social or economic impacts.

**CS3 Presumption in favour of sustainable development**

When considering development proposals the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with polices in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise – taking into account whether:

a) Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or

b) Specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.

**CS4 Infrastructure Delivery**
The borough council will normally require that on-site infrastructure requirements are met via planning conditions or a Section 106 agreement. Developers will be required to demonstrate that the necessary infrastructure (green, social and physical) will be in place in advance of, or can be provided in tandem with, new development, and where appropriate arrangements are in place for its subsequent maintenance.

Where the provision of infrastructure is considered to be a strategic need and is included in the Council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (or CIL Regulation 123 list) then development, if liable, will be expected to contribute via the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Liability and levy rates will be shown in the council’s CIL Charging Schedule when it becomes effective. When the CIL Charging Schedule is effective, Section 106 contributions will not be sought for infrastructure that is included in the council’s Infrastructure Delivery Plan (or CIL Regulation 123 list). All infrastructure requirements will be co-ordinated and delivered in partnership with other authorities and agencies.

**CS6 Sustainable Design and Construction**
All development should, as far as possible, contribute towards reduction of CO2 emissions and generation of renewable energy. New development should seek to:

a) make effective use of resources and materials through sustainable design and construction

b) minimise water use and provide for waste reduction and recycling

c) use an energy hierarchy that seeks to use less energy, source energy efficiently, and make use of renewable energy

d) be sited and designed to withstand the long-term impacts of climate change

The council will expect that:

i. up to 2016, new residential development will be to a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or BREEAM residential Very Good and new non-residential buildings a minimum of BREEAM Very Good

ii. beyond 2016, new residential development should be to a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5, BREEAM residential Excellent and new non-residential buildings a minimum of BREEAM Excellent

Planning applications for major development within these categories will be expected to provide pre-assessment evidence demonstrating how they will meet these levels. For minor applications, the extent of evidence required will be set out within an updated Sustainable Design SPD.
Where development cannot demonstrate CSH or BREEAM compliance on-site, the council will consider evidence, appropriate to the scale and nature of development proposed, of the extent to which sustainability has informed the design of proposals, taking account of:
• Impact on viability
• Scale and nature of development
• Operational requirements of the proposed use
• Site specific constraints
• The need to meet other planning policy requirements
Beyond 2016 developments may be required to make a one-off financial contribution to be used achieve equivalent emissions savings through off site measures in accordance with the government’s zero carbon buildings policy. The amount of this payment, where applicable, will be determined on a site-by-site basis and calculated in line with a methodology to be set out in an updated Sustainable Design SPD.

**CS7 Managing the Water Cycle**

**Flood Risk**
The council will require flood risk to be considered for all development commensurate with the scale and impact of the proposed development. Development proposals and site allocations will:

a) be directed to locations with the least impact on flooding or water resources;

b) be assessed for their contribution to overall flood risk, taking into account climate change.

Within areas of functional floodplain, development is expected to preserve or enhance the contribution of the area to water management / reducing flood risk.

Outside flood zone 1, the redevelopment of previously developed land will be permitted where proposals can demonstrate that:

i. the development will deliver the economic, social and environmental regeneration of the borough that outweighs the risk of flooding and reduces flood risk overall;

ii. the safety of the development and users from flooding can be achieved and, as a minimum, there will be no increase in on or off-site flood risk demonstrated through a site-specific flood risk assessment;

iii. the proposed uses are compatible with the level of flood risk, and;

iv. a sequential approach to the location of uses has been taken within the site itself, including matching the vulnerability of uses to the risk of flooding.

**Improving the drainage network**
The council will seek opportunities to increase the capacity of the floodplain safely, make space for water across the whole borough, and to remove problems from the drainage network, particularly in connection with new development.

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be incorporated into all development, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not appropriate in a specific location. The council will seek the maximum possible reduction in surface water run-off rates based on the SFRA or most recent national guidance.
**CS8 Environmental Quality**  
The quality of the environment will be recognised at all levels of the planning and development process with the aim of protecting and enhancing environmental quality.  

**Air Quality:**  
Where appropriate, development proposals will include an assessment of impact on air quality and incorporate measures to avoid or mitigate increases in air pollution and minimise the exposure of people to poor air quality.  

**Water Contamination:**  
Where any such risk exists, developments must include measures to reduce or avoid water contamination and safeguard groundwater supply.  

**Unstable and Contaminated Land:**  
Proposals for development on land that is, or is suspected as being, contaminated or unstable will only be permitted if the land is capable of remediation and fit for the proposed use and shall include:  
a) a desk top survey with the planning application  
b) a phase II study and strategy for remediation and final validation where the desk top survey (a) indicates remediation may be necessary, on any full or reserved matters planning applications  

A programme of remediation and validation must be agreed before the implementation of any planning permission on contaminated and/or unstable land. The requirement to undertake this programme will be secured using planning conditions.

**CS9 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity**  
Chesterfield borough’s green infrastructure network will be recognized at all levels of the planning and development process with the aim of protecting and enhancing the network. Development proposals will be expected to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect, or result in the loss of, features of recognised importance.  

Development proposals are required to meet the following criteria where appropriate, and should:  
a) not harm the character or function of the Green Belt, Green Wedges and Strategic Gaps, and Local Green Spaces  
b) enhance connectivity between, and public access to, green infrastructure  
c) increase the opportunities for cycling, walking and horse riding  
d) enhance the multi-functionality of the borough’s formal and informal parks and open spaces  
e) conserve or enhance the local distinctiveness and character of the landscape  
f) enhance the borough’s biodiversity and where possible link habitats  
g) Protect existing ancient and non-ancient woodland and increase tree cover in suitable locations in the borough  
h) in cases where loss of a green infrastructure asset is unavoidable, include provision of alternative green infrastructure, on site where possible, to ensure a net gain in quantity, quality or function  

The council will require the submission with the planning application of ecological surveys and assessments of the biodiversity and geological value of sites as set out in a list of local requirements.
Where new green infrastructure is proposed, there must be clear funding and delivery mechanisms in place for its long term management and maintenance, prior to the development commencing.

Open Space, Play Provision and Sports Facilities

Where a need is identified, developments must contribute to sports and play provision in accordance with the standards set out in an adopted SPD. Planning permission will not be granted for development which would have a negative impact on or result in the loss of open space, play provision and sports facilities unless they are:

i. identified as surplus to demand, based on evidence and locally defined standards,

ii. The development would result in alternative or improved provision that better meets locally defined standards; and

iii. The site is not needed for other open space, play provision or sports facilities identified in locally defined standards

CS13 Economic Growth

Development should deliver sustainable economic growth by supporting existing jobs and businesses and delivering inward investment. Proposals that facilitate a mix of uses will be encouraged.

A range of sites suitable for employment use will be identified in the Local Plan: Sites and Boundaries for approximately 79 ha of new employment land between 2011 and 2031. Allocations and proposals for new employment development will be encouraged where they accord with the council’s overall spatial strategy as set out below:

a) B1(a) Office development within and on the edge of existing town and district centres and at developments at Chesterfield Waterside and Markham Vale as set out in policies PS3 and PS4

b) B1(b&c) Light Industrial in locations within and close to existing town and district centres

c) B1(b&c) and B2 Industrial uses within established business areas and at areas at Markham Vale, the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor, and the Chatsworth Road Corridor

d) B8 uses at Markham Vale and the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor. In other established business and industrial locations, new B8 uses will only be permitted where they would not have an unacceptable adverse impact as a result of traffic movements.

Other business and industrial uses, not falling within the B1, B2 or B8 classes, will be considered based upon the locational criteria set out in policy CS2, the suitability of the use for the location and the employment generation of the proposed use when compared to the existing or previous use. Where appropriate, conditions will be used to manage the use of such developments. Proposals for farm and rural diversification developments, live/work units and rural businesses will be supported where they are appropriate to the character and scale of the area and otherwise meet the policies of the plan.

Subject to policy CS2, the redevelopment or change of use of existing business and industrial sites for non-employment uses will only be permitted where:

i. It would not lead to a quantitative and/or qualitative deficiency in the supply of available employment land; and
ii. It would not inhibit existing or future business and industrial activity on adjacent sites.
Where appropriate, conditions will be used to manage the use of such developments.
For major development proposals, the council will seek to negotiate agreements with developers and occupiers covering recruitment, training and procurement to benefit the local economy and supply chain, so as to contribute to the sustainability of the borough and the surrounding area, both during construction and on a long-term basis.

**CS19 Historic Environment**
The council will protect the historic environment and heritage assets throughout the borough and seek to enhance them wherever possible. All new development must preserve or enhance the local character and distinctiveness of the area in which it would be situated.
The council will do this through:

a) a presumption against development that would unacceptably detract from views of St Mary’s Church (The Crooked Spire) by virtue of its height, location, bulk or design;
b) the protection of Designated Heritage Assets and their settings including Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens;
c) the use of Conservation Area Appraisals and associated Management Plans to ensure the preservation or enhancement of the individual character of each of the borough’s conservation areas;
d) the identification and, where appropriate, protection of important archaeological sites and historic environment features;
e) the identification and, where appropriate, protection of nondesignated heritage assets of local significance, compiled and referred to as The Local List;
f) Enhancing the character and setting of Queens Park, Chesterfield Market Place, the Hipper River Valley, Chesterfield Canal and locally important Historic Parks and Gardens.
The council has a presumption in favour of retaining heritage assets on The Local List. Development that involves substantial harm or loss of a non-designated heritage asset will not be acceptable unless it can be demonstrated that:

i. the asset is structurally unsound and poses a safety risk
ii. it is unviable to repair or maintain the asset
iii. alternative uses have been fully explored
iv. it would have wider social, economic or environmental benefits as part of a masterplanned regeneration scheme

Where a proposal that involves unavoidable harm or loss of a heritage asset on The Local List meets the criteria above, the council will seek a replacement development of a similar quality, where possible retaining the features of the heritage asset.

Where the council is satisfied that the loss of heritage assets (both designated and non-designated) is considered to be justified, the council will require the developer to have the asset surveyed and recorded by a suitably qualified
professional prior to the development commencing, and the records made publically available.

**CS20 Influencing the Demand for Travel**
To reduce congestion, improve environmental quality and encourage more active and healthy lifestyles, the Council will seek to maximize walking, cycling and the use of public transport through the location and design of development and parking provision. Priority will be given to measures to encourage more sustainable travel choices.

To secure this aim, the council will expect development proposals to demonstrate the following:

a) Prioritisation of pedestrian and cycle access to and within the site
b) Protection of, or improvements to the strategic pedestrian and cycle network
c) Demand management measures such as car clubs, car sharing and appropriate parking provision in accordance with the guidance set out in Appendix G
d) Protection of, or improvements to public transport provision and/or facilities
e) Provision of opportunities for charging electric vehicles where appropriate

The impacts of any remaining traffic growth expected, shall be mitigated through physical improvements to the highways network where necessary, to ensure that development has an acceptable impact on the functioning and safety of the highway network.

Any necessary mitigation measures should be set out in development proposals, including within Transport Statements, Transport Assessments and Travel Plans where these are required, and secured through conditions and/or legal agreements.

Priority areas for combinations of sustainable transport measures and highways improvements will be:

i. The A61 Corridor
ii. The A619 Chatsworth Road
iii. The A619 corridor through Brimington and Staveley
iv. Chesterfield Town Centre
v. Access to Chesterfield Railway Station

For masterplanned or phased developments, provision for the monitoring of traffic impact, and mitigation of identified problems will be made through the use of legal agreements.

**PS4 Markham Vale**
All development within the Markham Vale area must contribute to the role of the area as a strategic employment site of sub-regional importance.

Within the Markham Vale area, as indicated on diagram 11, planning permission for works or development not covered by the existing outline planning permission will only be granted where they can demonstrate that they:

a) Support the principal objectives of the Markham Vale development and the advanced manufacturing in particular; and
b) Support job creation; and

c) Meet the needs of businesses on the site; and
d) Minimise any adverse impact on the local and national highways network; and 
e) have no unacceptable impacts upon heritage assets, their settings and key 
views outside of the Borough at Bolsover Castle and Sutton Scarsdale Hall; and 
f) Accord with the approved design framework for the site; and 
g) Meet the requirements of other relevant policies in the plan.

PS5 Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor
The borough council will publish an Area Action Plan for the Staveley and Rother Valley Corridor demonstrating how the area will be comprehensively redeveloped to create a sustainable urban extension in a landscape setting through a masterplanned approach.
The objectives of the masterplan will be to:
a) Deliver a range of new housing opportunities (up to 2000 dwellings) focussed on the centre and western end of the corridor
b) Create employment opportunities (up to 50ha) focussed on the Hall Lane end of the corridor and around Works Road
c) Provide a new local centre to serve both the development itself and adjacent communities of Barrow Hill and Hollingwood
d) Develop a sustainable community including on-site energy generation where possible and practicable.
e) Enhance the quality of and access to the landscape and green infrastructure, particularly the Chesterfield Canal and River Rother waterways
f) Deliver access and transport improvements, emphasising sustainable transport
g) Improve water management on site
h) Provide for the remediation and re-use of contaminated and unstable land where possible and practicable
i) conserve and enhance the quality of the historic environment, taking account of designated and non-designated heritage assets within and closely related to the site.

Development proposals must be brought forward as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the area and must demonstrate how they will deliver the objectives of the Area Action Plan.

Saved Local Plan Policies

EVR 1 Green Belt
Within the green belt planning permission will not be granted for new development of an urban character such as housing, industry, commerce, office development and retailing.
Proposals for land uses which preserve the openness of the green belt and the purposes of including land in it, as well as proposals for new buildings related to agriculture, forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation, cemeteries and other appropriate uses in the green belt, will be permitted provided that:
(a) the proposal would not detract from an area where the open character of the green belt is particularly vulnerable because of its prominence or narrowness; and (b) the scale, siting, design, materials and landscape
treatment are such that the visual effect of the proposal is minimised and buildings are in keeping with their surroundings and reflect local character.

Planning permission will be granted for the conversion or change of use of existing buildings in the green belt provided that criteria (a) and (b) above are met and that:

(c) the proposed use does not have a significantly greater impact on the green belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing use; and

(d) any extension or associated use of land surrounding the building would not conflict with the openness of the green belt and the purposes of including land within it.

Planning permission will be granted for extensions and alterations to dwellings in the green belt provided that they:

(e) are proportionate to the size and in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling;

(f) are constructed of appropriate building materials; and

(g) do not have an adverse impact on the setting of the dwelling or the green belt.

Planning permission will be granted for the redevelopment of existing dwellings in the green belt provided that:

(h) the proposed dwelling does not have a greater impact on the openness of the green belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing dwelling and does not occupy a materially larger area of the site than the existing buildings.

EVR 2 Development in the Open Countryside and Other Open Land

Within the areas of open countryside and other open land planning permission will only be granted for new development which is necessary for the needs of agriculture and forestry or is related to recreation, tourism or other types of farm or rural diversification provided that:

(a) the location of the development outside the settlement framework is sustainable;

(b) the proposal would not detract from an area where the open character of the countryside is particularly vulnerable because of its prominence or narrowness (including the quality of the landscape and any nature conservation interest); and

(c) the scale, siting, design, materials and landscape treatment are such that the visual effect of the proposal is minimised and buildings are in keeping with their surroundings and reflect local character; and

(d) the proposal would not lead to undue disturbance by the creation of excessive noise or traffic or the attraction of large numbers of people.

(e) the proposed development including any activities outside the building would avoid unnecessary urbanisation and sprawl and not materially harm the rural landscape.

Planning permission will be granted for the conversion or change of use of existing buildings in areas of open countryside provided that criteria (a) to (e) above are met and that the building is suitable for the intended use without the need for significant extension or major reconstruction. Proposals for conversion or change of use of rural buildings for housing purposes will only be acceptable if evidence is submitted to show that efforts have been made to
secure re-use which furthers employment or if employment use would be inappropriate in that location or that building.
Planning permission will be granted for the redevelopment of existing buildings in areas of open countryside only for uses which are necessary for the needs of agriculture and forestry or are related to recreation, tourism or other types of farm or rural diversification provided that criteria (a) to (e) above are met and that:
(f) the proposed building does not have a greater impact on the open character of the countryside and the purpose of including land within it than the existing buildings and does not occupy a materially larger area of the site than the existing buildings.
Planning permission will be granted for the replacement of existing dwellings with new dwellings provided that criteria (c) and (f) above are met.

**TRS 2 Transport Schemes Associated with Markham Employment Growth Zone (Markham Vale) and the M1**
Planning permission will not be granted for development which would prejudice the implementation of the following major transport infrastructure schemes:
(a) widening of the M1 (as shown on the proposals map);
(b) junction 29a and associated local road improvements including the lowgates link (as shown on the proposals map);
(c) the chesterfield-staveley regeneration route (as shown on the proposals map);
(d) a new rail station and strategic park and ride facility at Seymour junction (if located within the borough);
(e) a new freight terminal at Markham Vale;
(f) the reopening of the Clowne branch railway between Creswell and Seymour junction and the use of the existing freight lines to Chesterfield and Sheffield for passenger services (as shown on the proposals map).